

REMARKS


This Amendment is submitted in response to the February 21, 2007 Office Action issued in connection with the above-identified patent application. Claims 1-19 have been amended as set forth above. No new matter has been added. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner review and consider the amended claims in view of the following remarks.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has objected to the Abstract. In response, applicants request that the Abstract be replaced with the substitute Abstract submitted herewith. It is believed that the substitute Abstract overcomes the Examiner's objections.

Claims 1-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because of the presence of various terminology, for using a broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation, and for lacking antecedent basis for certain terms. The Examiner indicated, however, that claims 1-19 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. In response, applicants have amended the claims as set forth hereinabove to address the indefiniteness rejections and to conform the claims to customary U.S. patent practice. It is believed that the claim amendments address all of the Examiner's comments and do not affect the scope of the claims. All pending claims should now be in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,
COHEN PONTANI LIEBERMAN & PAVANE LLP

By



Edward M. Weisz
Reg. No. 37,257
551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210
New York, New York 10176
(212) 687-2770

Dated: June 21, 2007